

fundamentally misunderstands the purpose and application of Rule 56(f). Once again, Amadasu fails to explain why more discovery is needed or what material he hopes to uncover. General and conclusory statements, like those made by Amadasu, do not meet the requirements of Rule 56(f).

The issue before this Court on Defendants' joint motion to strike is a legal one, not a factual one and further discovery would only serve to needlessly prolong this litigation. Amadasu failed to timely identify experts and is now improperly attempting to rely on Defendants' experts to avoid summary judgment. No additional discovery can change those facts. As such, his identification of experts should be stricken and summary judgment should be entered against him.

In addition, Amadasu's latest reply³ in support of his previous motion to stay demonstrates his continued misunderstanding of the application of Rule 56(f). Amadasu incorrectly states that "[w]hile the discovery is still ongoing motion pursuant to FRCP 56(f) would be untimely premature and may invite sanction under the inherent power of the court."⁴ Nothing in the language of the rule or in case law supports this reading. Indeed, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for Amadasu to argue that he had not had adequate time for discovery pursuant to R. 56(f), if he were allowed to file it only after the close of discovery. Such an interpretation defies logic and is clearly contrary to the intended application of summary judgment to avoid unnecessary delay and costs associated with meritless claims.

Accordingly, Amadasu's Motion to Stay should be denied and he should be ordered to respond to Defendants' Motion to Strike Amadasu's Supplemental Disclosure of Expert and Lay Witnesses immediately. Alternatively, Defendants' Motion to Strike should be granted as

³ Docket No. 68.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 1.

unopposed. Time being of the essence, Defendants' counsel can make themselves available to argue this and all other pending issues at a date and time that is convenient with the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Deborah R. Lydon

Deborah R. Lydon (0013322)
Jennifer Orr Mitchell (0069594)
Matthew S. Arend (0079688)
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 977-8200
Counsel for Defendant Dr. Berry

/s/ Karen A. Carroll

Karen A. Carroll
Kohnen & Patton LLP
PNC Center, Suite 800
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 381-0656
Counsel for the Mercy Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on October 27th, 2006 I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all except Plaintiff Darlington Amadasu. I also sent the foregoing via U.S. mail to Plaintiff at the address listed below:

Darlington Amadasu, pro se
P.O. Box 6263
Cincinnati, OH 45206

/s/ Jennifer Orr Mitchell

Jennifer Orr Mitchell